



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/599,557	10/02/2006	Gerard Herman Hotho	NL 040657	1828
24737	7590	03/23/2010		
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS			EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 3001			JACKSON, JAKIEDA R	
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510				
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2626		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		03/23/2010	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/599,557

Applicant(s)

HOTHOT ET AL.

Examiner

JAKIEDA R. JACKSON

Art Unit

2626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 December 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. In response to the Office Action mailed September 3, 2009, applicant submitted an amendment filed on December 2, 2009, in which the applicant amended and requested reconsideration.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's have amended the claims and argue that the prior art cited does not specifically teach an encoder being operable when generating the down-mix output signals for also generating said parametric data configured (i) to allow for subsequent decoding of the down-mix output signals (ii) for predicting (iii)(1) signals of channels processed and (iii)(2) then discarded within the encoder, thereby enabling a subsequent decoding via a decoder to substantially regenerate with enhanced accuracy the corresponding discarded channels by predicting information of the discarded channels from the down-mix output signals and the parametric data. Applicant's explains that Thumpudi teaches away from performing additional coding by the encoder, since Thumpudi teaches dropping one or more input channels to reduce a coding complexity (paragraph 0377). However, Applicant's misunderstood that passage. In fact, Thumpudi teaches towards subsequent encoding, teaching that the encoder groups windows of multi-channel audio for subsequent encoding. This gives the encoder flexibility to use different window configuration for different channels in a frame, while also allowing multi-channel transforms on various combinations of channels for the

frame. A decoder works during decoding (paragraphs 0196 and 0185). Therefore, Applicant's arguments that Thumpudi teach away are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). Furthermore, an explanation of why it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art to combine the references was furnished.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1-13** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Craven et al. (USPN 7,193,538), hereinafter referenced as Craven in view of Thumpudi et al. (PGPUB 2004/0049379), hereinafter referenced as Thumpudi.

Regarding **claim 1**, Craven discloses a multi-channel encoder operable to process input signals conveyed in a plurality of input channels (channels) to generate corresponding output data comprising down-mix output signals (downmix) together with complementary parametric data, the encoder (abstract) including:

(a) a down-mixer for down-mixing the input signals to generate the corresponding down-mix output signals (downmix; column 6, lines 4-44); and

(b) an analyzer for processing the input signals, said analyzer being operable to generate said parametric data complementary to the down-mix output signals (downmix; column 6, lines 4-44 with column 7, lines 5-16), but does not specifically teach that said encoder being operable when generating the down-mix output signals (i) to allow for subsequent decoding of the down-mix output signals (ii) for predicting (iii)(1) signals of channels processed and (iii)(2) then discarded within the encoder.

Thumpudi disclose an encoder wherein said an encoder being operable when generating the down-mix output signals for also generating said parametric data configured (paragraphs 0123, 0166 and 0275) (i) to allow for subsequent decoding (paragraphs 0185 and 0196) of the down-mix output signals (ii) for predicting (iii)(1) signals of channels processed and (iii)(2) then discarded within the encoder, thereby enabling a subsequent decoding via a decoder to substantially regenerate with enhanced accuracy the corresponding discarded channels by predicting information of the discarded channels from the down- mix output signals and the parametric data (if the encoder drops one or more channels, one or more phantom channels based in decoded channels can be created; paragraphs 0362-0377), to improve quality.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art at the time the invention was made to modify Craven's encoder as described above, to reconstruct the signal (paragraph 0369), which improves the quality and the overall listening experience (paragraph 0067), as taught by Thumpudi.

Regarding **claim 2**, Craven discloses a multi-channel encoder wherein said encoder being operable to process the input signals on the basis of time/frequency tiles (frequency; column 21, lines 5-20).

Regarding **claim 3**, Craven discloses a multi-channel encoder (encoder) wherein the tiles are defined either before or in the encoder during processing of the input signals (column 21, lines 5-20).

Regarding **claim 4**, Craven discloses a multi-channel encoder wherein the analyzer is operable to generate at least part of the parametric data (C.sub.1,iC.sub.2i) by applying an optimization of at least one signal (signal) derived from a difference between one or more input signals (difference) and an estimation of said one or more input signals which can be generated from output data from the multi-channel encoder (column 2, line 65 – column 3, line 3).

Regarding **claim 5**, Craven discloses a multi-channel encoder wherein the optimization involves minimizing an Euclidean norm (Euclidean; column 10, lines 21-55).

Regarding **claim 6**, Craven discloses a multi-channel encoder wherein there are N input channels (channels) which the analyzer is operable to process to generate for each time/frequency tile the parametric data, the analyzer being operable to output

M(N-M) parameters together with M down-mix (downmix) output signals for representing the input signals in the output data; M and N being integers and $M < N$ (column 6, lines 4-44).

Regarding **claim 7**, Craven discloses a multi-channel encoder according wherein the integer M is equal to two such the output signals (signals) are susceptible to being replayed in two-channel stereophonic apparatus (DVD) and being coded by a standard stereo coder (column 6, lines 4-44).

Regarding **claim 8**, Craven discloses a signal processor for inclusion in a multi-channel encoder (encoder), the processor being operable to process (downmix) data in the multi-channel encoder for generating its down-mix output signals and parametric data (column 6, lines 4-44).

Regarding **claim 9**, it is interpreted and rejected for similar reasons as set forth in claim 1.

Regarding **claim 10**, Craven discloses an encoded output data generated wherein said output data stored on a data carrier (storage medium; column 6, lines 62-67).

Regarding **claim 11**, Craven discloses a multi-channel decoder for decoding output data generated by a multi-channel encoder, the decoder comprising:

(a) processing means for receiving down-mix output signals (downmix) together with parametric data from the encoder, the processing means being operable to process the parametric data to determine one or more coefficients or parameters (column 6, lines 4-44); and

(b) computing means for calculating an approximate representation of each input signal encoded into the output data using the parameter data (computational) and also the one or more coefficients determined in step (a) for further processing to substantially regenerate representations of input signals giving rise to the output data generated by the encoder (column 6, lines 4-44).

Regarding **claim 12**, Craven discloses a signal processor for use in a multi-channel decoder, said signal processor (processor) being operable to assist in processing data in association with regenerating representations of input signals (signals; column 24, lines 19-37).

Regarding **claim 13**, it is interpreted and rejected for similar reasons as set forth in claim 11.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Herre et al. (USPN 7,447,317) discloses compatible multi-channel coding/decoding by weighting the downmix channel.

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JAKIEDA R. JACKSON whose telephone number is (571)272-7619. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 5:30am-2:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Hudspeth can be reached on 571-272-7843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/David R Hudspeth/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2626

/Jakieda R Jackson/
Examiner, Art Unit 2626
March 12, 2010